These arguments concerning secrecy and the exclusively executive nature of the intelligence function are, though unpersuasive, at least consistent. But strangely enough, those who oppose the idea of a joint committee insist as well that congressional surveillance is already more than adequate. This contention was made by Allen Dulles in his recent book and by President Kennedy, in answer to a question at his October 9 press conference.

What, in fact, is the present extent of congressional surveillance over intelligence activities? As mentioned, in both the House and Senate the bodies responsible for overseeing the intelligence community are subcommittees of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. Neither the House Foreign Affairs Committee nor the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has jurisdiction in this area despite their obvious interest in intelligence matters. This might not matter were it not that the surveillance exercised by the four existing subcommittees is both cursory and sporadic.

At the time I introduced the resolution proposing the joint committee and spoke on the floor of the House in favor of it, Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon, the second-ranking minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services, had this to say:

"Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think we should have had a joint committee to monitor the CIA when it was first established. I have had a little experience in the matter as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. As you may know, we have a subcommittee on the CIA. I was a member of that committee for 4 years. We met annually—one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing. I think a proposal such as Mr. LINDSAY has made is the answer to it because a part-time subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, as I say, which meets for just 2 hours, 1 day a year, accomplishes nothing whatsoever. I want to compliment the gentleman on his proposal."

The reasons for the lack of adequate check and examination are almost self-evident: The members of the four subcommittees themselves, by definition, have relatively low status. But even had those subcommittees both status and time, the difficulties involved in dividing jurisdiction among the four would, I think, be insuperable.

It should be clear from what I have said that the bipartisan proponents of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence are fully aware that a high degree of secrecy is essential to the workings of the intelligence community. Neither I nor any legislator wishes to see the legitimate secrets of the intelligence community reported in the press and on the air. Indeed, this seems far more likely to occur under present conditions because the press, sometimes called "the fourth branch of the Government," may turn out to be the only effective check on intelligence activities—and that check could be dangerous as well as disruptive. But danger and disruption are certain if public confidence in the intelligence establishment erodes. It is less likely if a body of the people's representatives, properly constituted and carefully chosen by the leadership of the two Houses of Congress, remains continuously aware of the activities of the intelligence community. The performance of this function is nothing less than their duty to the American people, whose lives and liberties are profoundly involved in the intelligence activities of our Government.

Finally, I would observe that such a joint congressional committee would perform a useful, perhaps an indispensable, service for the Intelligence community itself. There has been a tendency to assign the burden of blame to the CIA when some foreign undertakings have gone bad or failed altogether. Whether the blame has been justified—as in some cases it may have been—or whether unjustified, the liability to blame is apparent, and the CIA, unlike other less inhibited agencies, can do little to defend itself. A joint committee could do much to maintain the record fairly.

As the central Government grows in size and power, and as the Congress, like parliaments everywhere, tends to diminish in importance, the need for countervailing checks and balances becomes all the more important. The shaping and implementation by secret processes of some part of foreign policy is an extremely serious matter in a free society. It cannot be shrugged off or stamped as an inescapable necessity because of the dangers of the time and the threat from present enemies of democracy. To do so is to deny our history and to gamble dangerously with our future. There are internal as well as external dangers. Free political systems and individual liberties can be swiftly undermined. Confidence in the systems and liberties themselves can be lost even more swiftly. And when that happens to a free society, no foreign policy, however well conceived, will protect its highest interest, the continuation of the free system of government and the society on which it rests.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

(Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ASHBROOK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I should like once again to draw the attention of the Congress to the subtle, yet monstrous, discrimination against the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

We have renewed indications that despite repeated refutation of the charges, the Soviet Government is continuing to treat its citizens of the Jewish faith cruelly and with definite bias. These acts are to be deplored and protested, not only by all freedom-loving Americans, but officially by our Government through its diplomatic channels and through the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a group of well-known Western scholars wrote to Mr. Khrushchev inquiring into the situation. They referred specifically to the current trial of 23 persons for so-called economic crimes. Eleven of these persons were known to be Jewish, including the alleged ringleader. Premier Khrushchev replied as follows:

> There has never been, and there is not now, a policy of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union * * *. Our Constitution proclaims equality of the citizens of the U.S.S.R. irrespective of nationality or race.

This response is absurd and ridiculous. To the contrary, circumstances do not bear him out. The facts clearly point otherwise.

It is perfectly obvious that the Soviet Government has consistently exerted pressure in bearing down upon the maintenance and development of Jewish cultural and religious life. There have been efforts to seriously curtail publishing in Hebrew. The authorities, in the general antireligious campaign, have concentrated upon the closing of synagogues wherever feasible. Jews in Moscow were prohibited from arranging burials in Jewish cemeteries. These are but a few flagrant instances of a deliberate policy.

Last October, before the recent court case, the Government newspaper Izvestia demanded a public show trial of the defendants accused of bizarre economic crimes. The names of the Jewish accused were prominently displayed.

The show trial never developed because the Kremlin rulers did not want to reveal the names of Government officials who supposedly took bribes. All Western newsmen were barred from the trial.

Now Theodore Shabad reports in the New York Times of this morning, February 27, that nine death sentences have been pronounced by the court. It is evident from reports that the majority were Jews.

Despite all its disavowals, we cannot believe that Russia is making any sincere effort to halt the anti-Jewish prejudice. To the contrary, through cunning device the Soviet Union is perpetrating further outrages against the Jewish community.

Typically, the American Jewish Committee recently reported that a Soviet Government body had released a sinister book attacking the Jews. It is an insulting and cynical onslaught against the Jewish population. The Institute of Human Relations in New York obtained a copy.

I wish to applaud the remarks of the new president of this dedicated committee, Mr. Morris Abram, which he made as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Mr. Abram denounced the book as a "hodgepodge of misinformation, distortion, malicious gossip and insulting references to Jews and Judaism."

The book, written by a Soviet professor of philosophy, is a product of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. We know that almost all literature in the Soviet Union, certainly work of this nature, is censored and published only with the approval of the regime.

We cannot believe that such a discriminatory piece could be printed without the consent of the authorities. The Soviet Government is cloaking its anti-Jewish policy by allowing academic groups to apply the pressure in its stead.

The Kremlin does not want the West to believe that it is anti-Jewish. So the rulers subtly permit so-called private organizations and groups to promote discrimination so they will not be labeled with the ugly fact.

Throughout Russia's long history, treatment of the Jewish minority has varied between outright oppression and behind-the-scenes discrimination. The majority of rulers, including Stalin, believed that the Jewish nationality represented a separate and cohesive entity, a separateness which inherently constituted a threat to central government.

The situation is not radically different today. Dictatorship will always fear religious or racial identities within its area of rule. It will always seek to weaken ties of allegiance to anything excepting its own being.

Our Government must seek to secure equality of treatment for the Jewish people of Russia. We must seek to end the discrimination against them. We cannot succeed by remaining oblivious to

the manifold evidence of ill-treatment which is accumulating. We should utilize all the diplomatic instrumentalities at our command, and work actively through the United Nations, to obtain a reversal of the ominous trends of Soviet anti-Semitism.

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. ASHBROOK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CUNNINGHAM'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WITHDRAWAL OF JURISDICTION FROM FEDERAL COURTS IN LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING MATTERS

(Mr. MEADER (at the request of Mr. ASHBROOK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide that district courts of the United States shall not have jurisdiction to enjoin or modify the operation of State laws respecting legislative districts where comparable relief is available in State courts, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in this matter was first aroused by the decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*, March 26, 1962, 362, U.S. 355. I commented on this decision in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16, 1962, pages 13,745 to 13,754.

I agree with Justice Frankfurter's decision in the Baker against Carr case that the Court has made a grave error in entering the field of legislative redistricting and my bill is designed to withdraw Federal court jurisdiction and the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in matters of this kind.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has announced that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee will commence hearings March 18, 1964, on his bill to establish criteria or guidelines governing congressional districts. I believe it would be appropriate in those same hearings to consider the propriety of Federal courts entertaining suits commenced by citizens, the effect of which is to place the courts in a position of supremacy over a coequal branch of the Government, and to have judicial determination of a matter most vital to the independence of the legislative branch, namely its composition.

I hope this legislation will receive serious consideration by the House Judiciary Committee.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 10181

A bill to provide that district courts of the United States shall not have jurisdiction to enjoin or modify the operation of State laws respecting legislative districts where comparable relief is available in State courts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1361. Legislative districts

"A district court shall not have jurisdiction of any civil action—

"(1) to enjoin, suspend, or modify the operation of any State law respecting the boundaries of, or the number of persons to be elected from, any district to be represented in the legislature of such State or in the Congress of the United States; or

"(2) for damages arising out of the operation of any such State law;

if an action for comparable relief would be within the jurisdiction of, and justiciable in, a court of such State."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1361. Legislative districts."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 81 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1259. Exception to appellate jurisdiction in cases involving legislative districts

"The Supreme Court of the United States shall not have appellate jurisdiction of any civil action of any type described in paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of section 1361 of this title regardless of whether such action was originally brought in a State or Federal court."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1259. Exception to appellate jurisdiction in cases involving legislative districts."

(Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. ASHBROOK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. LIPSCOMB'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WHY FEED THOSE WHO SHUT OFF WATER AT GUANTANAMO?

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. ASHBROOK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have urgently requested that President Johnson embargo Cuba-bound lard shipments to Canada. It has come to my attention that U.S. traders in Montreal are now completing a deal to ship 20 million pounds of U.S. lard worth about $2 million to Castro via Canada. Lard shipments to Castro are permitted under present administrative rules, but the President could change the rules instantly with the stroke of a pen.

This transaction should be halted until all facts are known, and until its potentially adverse effect on our foreign policy can be fully explored. The United States is attempting to restore free world economic sanctions against Castro, an effort which was badly shattered by our feverish effort to deliver wheat to Russia.

A food sale of this magnitude to Castro might completely destroy our position of free world leadership.

These questions should be answered: Can we logically oppose British bus sales to Cuba, but permit U.S. lard sales? Is lard less strategic than a bus? Why is lard being shipped to Castro by way of Canada? Is it because U.S. longshoremen have already effectively shown their opposition to Russia-bound wheat and might block Cuba-bound lard?

I hope the President will act quickly, revise export regulations, and block this aid to Castro before it is too late.

To me, it is foolish and fantastic to help feed the same Communists who turned off the water at Guantanamo.

A FURTHER COMMENTARY ON OUR ECONOMIC STATISTICS

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. ASHBROOK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1963, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an article on our economic statistics by Dr. Oskar Morgenstern of Princeton University. The article was critical of the methods of collection of our statistics and particularly urged that more attention be given to determining the margin of error in our economic statistics. Subsequently, I received a large number of comments from economists supporting the general observations in Dr. Morgenstern's article. These were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 27.

I have now received a thorough and scholarly commentary on Dr. Morgenstern's article prepared by Raymond T. Bowman, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I highly recommend Dr. Bowman's letter to those who are interested in our statistical programs and what is being done and can be done to improve them. Under unanimous consent, I include his letter in the RECORD at this point.

I am certain that this will move the dialog on this important matter forward. I trust more comments will be forthcoming from other scholars and particularly from Dr. Morganstern. Hopefully the subcommittee on Economic Statistic of the Joint Economic Committee will hold hearings on the general subject matter in the near future:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I greatly appreciate your note to me requesting my comments on the article by Prof. Oskar Morgenstern which appeared in the October 1963 issue of Fortune magazine. I have delayed replying until I could give this important matter my personal attention.

As you know, I have for many years been particularly interested and concerned, both personally and in official capacities, with promoting and developing economic and social statistics better designed to aid analysis. I had been familiar with the first edition of Professor Morgenstern's book "On the Accuracy of Economic Observations," published in 1950, which presented much the